



**CITY OF SCOTTSDALE HOUSING BOARD
WORK STUDY SESSION
FIRE STATION 2, COMMUNITY MEETING ROOM
7522 E. INDIAN SCHOOL ROAD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251
MARCH 10, 2011**

SUMMARIZED MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT: Joe Campodall'Orto, Chair
Nancy Cantor, Vice-Chair
Harold Roth, Board Member
Fred Shapiro, Board Member
Nick Thomas, Board Member

ABSENT: Daniel Gottlieb, Board Member
Kathleen Puchek, Board Member

STAFF: Malcolm Hankins, Code Enforcement Manager
Raun Keagy, Citizen & Neighborhood Resources Director
Luis Santaella, Senior Assistant City Attorney

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Campodall'Orto called the work study session of the Scottsdale Housing Board to order at 2:06 p.m. A formal roll call confirmed the members present as stated above.

1. CODE ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (Information Item)

Mr. Hankins presented a brochure entitled "Code Enforcement, Community and Economic Development" as well as a one-page flyer about the City's Code Cares Program explaining that the purpose of the Code Cares Program was to give Scottsdale homeowners resources to assist with maintenance challenges in order to stay in compliance with code.

The Code Enforcement Department has obtained approval to solicit services and supplies from Scottsdale business owners such as gravel, trees, paint, landscaping, and much more.

Mr. Hankins reported that he was invited to a meeting of various code enforcement agencies by the Luis Palau Association in order to discuss connecting volunteers with citizens that need assistance.

He explained that Code Enforcement has had 200-300 volunteers assist with various projects through the Code Cares Program such as gravel landscaping, tree removal, painting, palm tree trimming, and landscaping within the City of Scottsdale.

Mr. Hankins stated that recently a homeowner received a notice of violation and the Scottsdale Area Association of Realtors assisted the City's Code Cares Program with painting, extermination services, and other repairs.

Board Member Shapiro pointed out that there was no website listed on the City's Code Cares Program and Mr. Hankins agreed to provide the Board with that information.

In response to Board Member Shapiro's inquiry, Mr. Hankins explained that Code Enforcement directs most participants facing physical or financial hardships to contact Michele Bruce for a questionnaire to see if they qualify for assistance with their maintenance issues.

Board Member Thomas inquired whether Code Enforcement's process for addressing maintenance issues involved the issuance of a ticket, citation, warrant, or corrective order to a homeowner.

Mr. Hankins explained that Code Enforcement has a hierarchy of violation types and whenever a violation deals with hazardous conditions such as vacant buildings or infested green pools they have mechanisms within the ordinance that allows them to fence, screen, shield, board up, secure or remove.

In response to Board Member Shapiro's inquiry regarding the number of homeowners assisted through the program in 2010, Mr. Hankins said that since the program began they have assisted with the maintenance of 40 Scottsdale properties.

In response to Board Member Thomas' inquiry regarding Code Enforcement's legal mechanism when dealing with non-responsive violators, Mr. Hankins summarized that a violator was notified either in person or through a door hanger that lists common violations.

He elaborated that once Code Enforcement begins the abatement process through a 30-day notice for non-emergency issues, they can hire contractors to assist with pool drainage, cutting of grass, and boarding up buildings.

In response to Board Member Thomas' inquiry regarding Code Enforcement's legal authority, Mr. Hankins stated that the Chapter 18 Property Maintenance and Nuisance Ordinance which contains the adopted Uniform Housing Code for the abatement of dangerous buildings gives them authority.

He reported that they currently have 12 inspectors, one staff member that addresses graffiti abatement, and two staff members that handle administrative tasks. Discussion ensued regarding the graffiti program quickly cleaning up over 1,200 sites annually with the results being tracked through photographs.

In response to Vice-Chair Cantor's inquiry regarding whether Code Enforcement received funds from the recently awarded grant for cameras, Mr. Hankins said they did not.

In response to Vice-Chair Cantor's inquiry regarding how Code Enforcement deals with multi-family housing maintenance issues resulting from foreclosures within neighborhoods such as Holiday Park or Belleview, Mr. Hankins stated that they use registration contact information to identify the responsible party in order to notify them of their violations. In the initial stage of foreclosure, Code Enforcement deals with the owner of record until the property changes hands.

Mr. Hankins discussed the timing of the City's Code Cares Program was very important in order to reach volunteers with a new vision to assist fellow citizens.

Chairman Campodall'Orto requested that he be placed on a volunteer list in order to help with one of the program's future projects. Mr. Hankins agreed to provide the Board with more information on the program.

2. BOARD AND COMMISSION AUDIT FOLLOW UP (Information Item)

Chair Campodall'Orto reported that the board and commission audit follow up was presented during the March 8, 2011 City Council meeting which he and Vice-Chair Cantor attended. He stated that staff divided the Boards and Commissions into three categories which included most effective, effective, and minimally effective.

Chair Campodall'Orto recalled staff reporting that the effectiveness of a board or commission was based on the number of action items it brought to City Council. The Housing Board only had four City Council action items since 2000.

Staff also stated that the Environmental Quality Advisory Board was less effective because of their lack of City Council action items. The board and commission criteria were prepared by Mayor Lane's administrator Janet Secor.

Chair Campodall'Orto recalled that a discussion ensued about the Energy Advisory Committee and Green Building Committee being no longer necessary since the City is now considered environmentally responsible.

He expressed his concerns that the Board's recommendations have been shelved by City Council in the past and that they are basing criteria on the Board's antiquated Statement of Purpose and Bylaws.

Vice-Chair Cantor elaborated that the Housing Board, Neighborhood Enhancement Commission, Scottsdale Pride Commission, Library Board, and Environmental Quality Advisory Board were deemed to be less effective than the other boards and commissions.

Mr. Keagy reported that the audit directed the City Manager to review all 26 of the City's boards and commissions to ensure that they were consistent in their bylaws and attendance policies, in addition to looking for overlaps and inefficiencies.

Mr. Keagy recalled that Ms. Secor had informed him that she would recommend combining the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission, Scottsdale Pride Commission, and the Housing Board into one neighborhood revitalization board. He told Ms. Secor that although he saw a thread to the Housing Board they really did not belong together, and she informed Mayor Lane of the discussion.

Mr. Keagy said Brent Stockwell informed him that he would like the Board to decide whether it was still relevant, whether it should remain a stand-alone organization, and whether it should be combined with the Human Services Commission as a result of their strong relationship in the CDBG and HOME Programs.

Another recommendation is to take half of the Housing Board members and combine them with the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission/ Scottsdale Pride Commission and take the remaining members and combine them with the Human Services Commission.

Discussion Regarding the Relevancy of the Board

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding whether the Housing Board could be an effective board while only having advisory powers.

Board Member Shapiro recommended that the Board decide what issue it wants to support, such as workforce housing, and bring it to City Council as an action item. Chair Campodall'Orto noted that although they are an advisory Board one of their recommendations could become future policy.

Board Member Roth commented that the lack of an approval process eliminates the effectiveness of the Housing Board and suggested that the Board address areas specific to its expertise.

Board Member Shapiro argued that the City did not need the Housing Board to review the CDBG grants, since the Human Services Commission has been facilitating that program for many years.

Board Member Thomas explained that that staff was only concerned with the dissemination of \$1,200,000 in federal funding for the CDBG and HOME Programs as reflected by grants being approved for organizations outside of the City.

Vice-Chair Cantor recalled that she reminded City Council that over the past three years the City has gone through three organizational restructures and staff has had to acclimate to changes of authority and responsibilities. She also suggested that City Council review how the boards and commissions are addressing corresponding elements of the General Plan.

Vice-Chair Cantor stated that the 2008 Housing Strategy has a Purpose Statement, Strategy Development, and Policy Section that includes a vision and guiding principles that defines the Housing Board as a stand-alone organization.

She presented copies of the Planned Unit Development prepared for the Southern Scottsdale Community Planning area explaining that the City's future will include mixed use housing, multifamily housing, as well as R1-7 and infill developments.

Mr. Keagy summarized that City Council's direction to staff was to agendize discussion and possible action on a comprehensive evaluation of the City's boards and commission program, including consideration of a possible elimination and/or consolidation of boards and commissions that are not statutorily required.

He opined that the Planning Commission and the Development Review Board were the only statutorily required organizations. Mr. Santaella pointed out that the Public Safety Retirement Board, Building Advisory Board of Appeals, and the Loss Trust Fund Board are also statutorily required.

Chair Campodall'Orto invited each Board member to express their opinion on whether a Housing Board is necessary for the City of Scottsdale. Board Member Shapiro argued that currently the Housing Board is unnecessary and Board Member Roth opined that the Statement of Purpose is too generic.

Vice-Chair Cantor explained the Housing Board could be relevant if it incorporated the policy statements and principles from the Housing Strategy as well as the Housing Element of the General Plan. She argued that the City does not understand the importance of future housing.

Board Member Thomas elaborated that the purpose of a board or commission is to bring external expertise to assist the City's staff with their tasks and if the Board or Commission does not bring forward something concrete and actionable then it is useless.

Board Member Shapiro recommended that the Board identify important housing issues facing the City today such as workforce or affordable housing, allowing flexibility for future changes. Board Member Roth stated that the next steps would be to propose specific actions such as the CDBG and HOME funds being offered primarily to Scottsdale citizens.

Vice-Chair Cantor said that it would have been important to obtain the Housing Board's feedback on the amendments to the R1-7 zoning codes, since it dealt with the rehabilitation of single family homes.

Combining Boards and Commissions

Mr. Keagy confirmed that the consensus of the Housing Board was that it was relevant and must choose a current housing issue to support. He invited the Board to discuss whether it should be combined with either the Human Services Commission or the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission.

Board Member Shapiro requested the definitions of both Commissions before making a decision. Chair Campodall'Orto argued that the Housing Board should not be combined with either Commission.

Mr. Santaella reported that the Human Services Commission's purpose was to:

"Advise the City Council on existing human services provided by the City for the purpose of improving and modifying services, the planning and development of Human Services to address the needs of the citizens. The coordination of private agencies, city services, and other governmental agencies delivering human services in the City. Providing opportunities for City involvement and such other human service issues as the City Council may direct.

"Review and make recommendations about certain types of funding such as community development, block grants, home investment partnership program, Scottsdale Cares, Scottsdale Community Endowment Fund for the Drinkwater Youth Services Fund, and City General Fund."

Board Member Roth pointed out that the CDBG and HOME Programs were part of the implementation tools of the City's housing program. Board Member Shapiro stated that the Human Services Commission pertains to social services and anything that would benefit humanity.

Mr. Santaella reported that the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission's purpose was to:

"Advise the City Council regarding the implementation of the City's neighborhood enhancement program focusing on the enhancing of the long-term viability of Scottsdale's neighborhoods. The Commission will make recommendations to the City Council on specific programs which are designed to prevent the decline and deterioration of neighborhoods by empowering the residents to help themselves. The Commission will review projects and concepts developed or proposed by the neighborhood enhancement coordinator, the Commission, or by the citizens."

In 2009 they were given the additional power to accept and solicit donations in accordance with the administrative regulations.

Vice-Chair Cantor argued that neither commission was charged with the creation and preservation of safe and affordable housing. She recommended that the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission be combined with the Scottsdale Pride Commission.

Vice-Chair Cantor argued that CSA and Bellevue were not on the City's radar until the Housing Board pointed them out. The City was not aware of the condition of those neighborhoods and the impacts of the incomplete redevelopments.

Board Member Shapiro recommended that the Housing Board should stand alone and the Neighborhood Enhancement Commission should be combined with the social services and housing programs of the Human Services Commission. Board Member Thomas stated that he did not have a comment.

Board Member Roth opined that there is overlap between the three organizations, and their roles should be redefined to eliminate the inappropriate functions. Chair Campodall'Orto argued that affordable and/or workforce housing were no longer the charge of the Housing Board since it has been mainly involved with the CDBG and HOME funding process.

Mr. Keagy reported that the Chair of the Scottsdale Pride Commission informed him that they have decided that they would be more effective as a non-profit affiliate of Keep America Beautiful.

3. **PRESENTATION BY BOARD MEMBER THOMAS THAT INCLUDES THREE SCENARIOS ON THE PROCESS OF HOW TO HANDLE RECOMMENDATIONS ON CDBG FUNDS FOR HOUSING RELATED ACTIVITIES (Information Item)**

Board Member Thomas opined that if someone asked him to be the housing official for the City of Scottsdale he would decline because he could not be effective given the organizational structure. He stated that the existing relationships are housing, neighborhood conservation, and economics.

Board Member Thomas explained that the City has an aging community and currently there was a lot of development that brings in tax dollars. He stated that City Council needs to understand that the maintenance of current housing relates to economics, which translates to sale, resale, and access for diverse income buyers.

Board Member Thomas commented that it makes a difference when a City's structure includes an ordinance that covers everything, empowers the people and board/commission leaders, and encourages interagency coordination.

East Lansing, Michigan

He recalled that when he was the housing/building official of East Lansing, the City Council mandated that staff, community development, public works, the human relations commission, and the state housing development authority must work together.

Board Member Thomas stated that the main difference was the Housing Commission was the key under the combined Community Development and Economic Development Departments. It was the Housing Commission that developed the Five-Year Plan.

East Lansing has a Community and Economic Development Department, and the Human Relations Commission provides social services assistance to that department.

The Housing Commission's charge was to address the physical condition of the homes in the neighborhoods, to protect the economic values of the neighborhoods and homes, and to provide social services to the residents through the \$600,000 of annual block grant funding.

Board Member Thomas summarized that 90% of the block grant funding stays in their community with 50% of the funding being allocated for senior citizens. In East Lansing it was mandated that a City Council member serve on both the Human Relations Commission and the Housing Board Commission.

Board Member Thomas reported that East Lansing's median household income was \$26,000, the median home condo value was \$176,000, and the gross development incentives, including zoning concessions, for three-bedroom unit developments that would rent for \$900 to \$1,200.

The charge of the Housing Commission was the protection of persons and property, public health and safety, senior disabled citizen public benefit services, low to moderate income citizen public benefit services, public infrastructure, maintenance and upgrades, and protection of commercial and residential property values.

Board Member Thomas highlighted that projects funded by the block grant program included step and porch repair, trip and fall hazard mitigation, and handrail installation inside and outside of the homes. He noted that their senior program offered home painting, the installation of external ramps, and the installation of walk-in bathtubs as long as the applicant met the census requirement or the income based qualifications.

Board Member Thomas explained that East Lansing Housing Commission was currently supervising two development projects that include affordable housing. A comparison with Dearborn, Michigan, which has a strong mayor, weak administrative structure, and strong department heads all appointed by the mayor.

Board Member Thomas explained that their development director has oversight over building, engineering, community development, planning and zoning. He stated that they have a Community Development and Neighborhood Conservation Board instead of a Housing Commission.

Board Member Thomas identified that the biggest difference between East Lansing/Dearborn Michigan and the City of Scottsdale, and these cities directly solicit input from the community regarding programs that affect them.

He stated that issues that relate to housing conditions and physical economics should go to the Housing Board and issues related to social services should go to the Human Services Commission, arguing that the Commissions should stay separate.

Board Member Thomas remarked that Scottsdale's Human Services Commission was allowing funding to go outside of the City because they are short staffed and do not have contractual relationships to get home repairs completed.

In response to Board Member Shapiro's comment that the Housing Board lacks definitive programs that it could oversee, Board Member Roth responded that there was no such lacking pointing out that the City's Five-Year Plan sets the priorities.

Board Member Thomas agreed to provide the Board members with copies of his presentation noting that the document includes a summary of relationships and the necessity for communication requirements. He stated that he would also provide information on the Wolf Court New Construction project.

4. DISCUSSION ON THE DRAFT ORDINANCE AMENDING THE PURPOSE, POWERS & DUTIES OF THE HOUSING BOARD (Discussion Item)

Mr. Santaella presented copies of the Board's existing ordinance which was revised in 2005 along with copies of the Proposed Draft Ordinance he recently prepared.

Vice-Chair Cantor explained that she merged together the relevant portions of the July 23, 2009 Housing Board Statement of Purpose with the Draft Ordinance prepared by Mr. Santaella. She pointed out that Mr. Santaella's suggested changes or deletions were noted by red text and the black text was the relevant sections of the Statement of Purpose.

Discussion ensued regarding preparing a general statement regarding what the Housing Board should be charged and whether it should be given powers that go beyond an advisory board.

Board Member Shapiro recommended adding terminology that addresses future housing issues. Board Member Roth pointed out that a mission statement was missing in the ordinance. Chair Campodall'Orto opined that the Statement of Purpose was intended to be the Board's mission statement.

Mr. Santaella explained that generally a Board/Commission would not codify a mission statement. He suggested that the Board use the purpose and powers delegated by City Council to develop a mission statement.

Vice-Chair Cantor suggested that the Board use the 2001 Housing Strategy Purpose Statement along with its Vision Statement and Guiding Principles as a starting point, since they were already approved by City Council. She recalled that before the City updated the General Plan the consultants did an assessment of the housing element which included the balance of jobs, fair housing, universal design, historic preservation, rebuilding practices, housing choice, and aging in place.

Vice-Chair Cantor elaborated that the Housing Element of the General Plan includes a vision statement, City government intervention and housing opportunities versus market driven houses, what Scottsdale values as far as housing, and goals and approaches.

Board Member Roth suggested scheduling another work study session to give more thought and discussion on this whole topic. Chair Campodall'Orto concurred.

Mr. Santaella recommended that the Board's next meeting be a work study session in order to finish the Statement of Purpose. Mr. Keagy agreed to combine agenda items 4 and 5 as one discussion topic for the April 14, 2011 Housing Board meeting. Chair Campodall'Orto requested that staff include the ordinance discussion.

Mr. Santaella stated that the Board should have its Purpose Statement endorsed by City Council before bringing the ordinance forward. Mr. Keagy explained that an ordinance must be placed on the agenda by the Mayor or City Council unless staff was bringing forward a report on a zoning case.

Board Member Shapiro suggested that a City Council member attend one Housing Board meeting annually to show involvement and to offer suggestions on housing issues.

Discussion ensued regarding agendizing the April 14, 2011 Housing Board meeting as a work study session in order to continue the Draft Ordinance discussion as well

as addressing the Board's responsibilities and activities for 2011. Mr. Keagy agreed to agendize the Draft Ordinance discussion as an action item.

5. **DISCUSSION ON HOUSING BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIVITIES FOR 2011 (Discussion Item)**

6. **DISCUSSION OF CREATING A POLICY STATEMENT THAT PROVIDES SCOTTSDALE RESIDENTS A PRIORITY WHEN ACCESSING CDBG AND HOME RELATED ACTIVITIES (Discussion Item)**

Mr. Keagy reported that he had not yet received follow up information from Community Assistance. He has been trying to obtain the federal statutes so that Mr. Santaella could review the fair housing requirements.

Mr. Santaella stated that staff would follow up on the federal statutes requested from Ms. Albanese in order to provide assistance with agenda item 6.

Board Member Thomas recalled that Ms. Albanese agreed to give the Board a presentation on the CDBG process. He opined that the CDBG Program should give priority to Scottsdale residents.

Board Member Roth stated that agenda items 6 and 7 go together, suggesting that the Policy Statement should dovetail the Five-Year Plan which sets the strategies and priorities.

7. **DISCUSSION OF CREATING A POLICY PROCEDURE FOR PRIORITIZING CDBG AND HOME FUNDS FOR HOUSING RELATED ACTIVITIES (Discussion Item)**

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc. DBA AVTranz